



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/814,042

03/20/2001

Kevin E. Crawford

END920000058US1(13761)

3522

7590

05/09/2006

Richard L. Catania, Esq.
Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/814,042	Applicant(s) CRAWFORD ET AL.	
	Examiner CESAR B. PAULA	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 3/2/2006.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claims 1-15, and 17 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent claims.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on 3/20/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The rejections of claims 1-15, and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and second paragraph, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peiffer, in view of “Laura Lemay’s Web Workshop JavaScript”, Lemay et al, hereinafter Lemay, Sams.net, 1996, pp.219-229.

Regarding independent claim 1, Peiffer discloses *a client* browser for downloading of a web page(s)—*web content file* containing web page source data having certain layout-- from a *server*. The web page contains Javascript applets—*storing information in a scripted language format* (col.1, lines 53-65, col.5, lines 11-33, col.6, lines 16-33).

Moreover, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out renderable, such as the filtering of html tags (data used to render the web page) from uppercase to lowercase, and replacement of formatting code with stylesheet, and non-renderable data, such as whitespaces—*renderable--*, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). The filtering out of the non-renderable data does not alter the layout of the web page. Peiffer fails to explicitly teach *removing pre-identified subject matter in said scripted language*. However, Lemay teaches the use of Javascript functions and comments (using “//” marks) for rotating advertisement banners, which are annoying to some users (page 227, line 10-page 229, line 9, list. 12.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peiffer, and Lemay and remove the Javascript comments in the web page, because Peiffer teaches above the benefit of stripping off non-renderable or unneeded data from a web page, thereby, thereby reducing the amount of data that has to be transmitted, and speeding up the display of the web page.

Furthermore, Peiffer teaches the sending of the filtered web page—*downloading to the browser the reduced size file* without the filtered objects—from the server to the requesting web browser client for display (col.1, lines 53-65, col.2, lines 1-16, 33-56, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19).

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, *--comments and unused logic blocks* etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 2, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, 31-56, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). Peiffer fails to explicitly teach *the unused logic blocks are functions that are in the file but not used*. However, Lemay teaches the use of Javascript functions and comments (using “//” marks) for rotating advertisement banners, which are annoying to some users (page 227, line 10-page 229, line 9, list. 12.4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peiffer, and Lemay, because Peiffer teaches above the benefit of stripping off unneeded data from a web page, thereby, thereby reducing the amount of data that has to be transmitted, and speeding up the display of the web page.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, —*consolidating into one logic blocks* of markup language representing the HTML lines—by deleting the non-renderable data—*shortening recurring identifiers --*, which are not needed, from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource (col.2, lines 1-16, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19).

Claims 6-9 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claims 1-4 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 11-14 are directed towards a program storage device for storing the steps found in claims 1-4 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 1, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource. The web page is then sent to the browser client (col.2, lines 1-16, 33-56, col.9, lines 12-68, fig.17-19). In other words, the display of the web page takes place at the client, without any recompilation after the size has been reduced at the server.

7. Claims 5, 10, and 15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peiffer, in view of Ross (Pat.# 6,163,780, 12/19/2000).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 4, Peiffer teaches the compressing or filtering the size of web pages by filtering out non-renderable data, such as whitespaces, comments, hard returns, etc., from the web page thereby creating a smaller modified resource—*consolidating into one logic blocks* of markup language representing the lines-- by filtering out the non-renderable data, because it does not perform a vital function to the web browser client for fails to explicitly teach *the consolidating step includes the step of identifying duplicated functions and replacing the duplicated functions with a reference to a single function in a library*. However, Ross teaches reducing the size or condensing of JAVA code by replacing each method or function in the code with a reference to the location to that method within a sorted class list—*single function in a library* (col.2, lines 9-11, 29-41, 54-67, col.3, lines 8-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peiffer, and Ross, because the benefit of compressing computer code so as to remove unnecessary code and data to shorten access, and execution times (col.1, lines 48-col.2, line 26). This in turn would lessen the load on the limited resources of the small device such as the one.

Claim 10 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the steps found in claim 5, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 15 directed towards a program storage device for storing the steps found in claim 5, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-15, and 17 have been considered but are not persuasive. Regarding the arguments about claims 1, 6, and 11 stating that Peiffer, Lemay, and Ross, do not teach or suggest the reduction of the size of a web content file by removing pre-identified renderable, and non-renderable data in a scripted language while maintaining the page layout of the file (page 8). The Applicant also asserts that renderable, and non-renderable data, which are, and are not used (respectively) by the browser to display the web page, as it was well known in the art (page 7, parag.4). The Examiner disagrees, that the prior art or record does not teach the removing of renderable and non-renderable data, because Peiffer teaches Filtering non renderable data, whitespace....and renderable data such as the filtering of html tags (data used to render the web page) from uppercase to lowercase, thus reducing the size of the html file (col.9, lines 1-67).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the Applicant submits that Peiffer does not address the changes to logic blocks, and the identifiers are not part of tagged languages (page 8, parag.4)) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Moreover, the Applicant notes that neither Peiffer, Lemay, nor Ross teach the removal of unused logic blocks (page 8, parag.5-page 9). The Examiner disagrees, because Peiffer teaches

the removal of renderable data in a lossless manner, such as the replacing uppercase characters with lowercase in an scripted html file, replacing formatting instructions with an equivalent stylesheet (col.9, lines 37-67). In other words, the removal of renderable data is done without disturbing the layout of the document.

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Dynamically Tailorable HTML, IBM TDB, vol.42, no.424, 8/1/1999., and Talati (Pat. # 5,999,942 A).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about

Art Unit: 2178

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866
217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)



CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

5/4/06